



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

VB

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,296	09/15/2003	Aman Naimat	ORCL5982	2613
53156	7590	03/26/2007	EXAMINER	
YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C. 4370 ALPINE RD. STE. 106 PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028			REYES, MARIELA D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,296	NAIMAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mariela D. Reyes	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/15/2003</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the title of the invention should not be in the invention's page. Correction is required. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

For the following 35 U.S.C 101 rejections refer to MPEP 2106.1 and excerpt of which is presented here:

I. FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL: "DATA STRUCTURES" REPRESENTING DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL *PER SE* OR COMPUTER PROGRAMS REPRESENTING COMPUTER LISTINGS *PER SE*

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material *per se* and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings *per se*, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material *per se* from claims that define statutory inventions.

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The instant claims are read as software per se because the system claims are missing functional hardware components for executing the claim's limitations. Software per-se is non-descriptive material therefore it doesn't fall into one of the statutory categories for patentability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "GuardianIQ 1.0: The Business Rule Approach to DQ" herein after GuardianIQ 1.0 as in view of Anand et al (US Patent 5,721,903).

Examiner's Note: The rejections are based on the above referenced documents, however GuardianIQ 1.0 doesn't include a date. Therefore examiner will rely in the document (attached) retrieved from the Internet with title "New Product News" and dated May 21, 2002 in which a mention is done about

GuardianIQ (Pages 1-2); because of this mention it is proved that there was a public knowledge of the functionalities of GuardianIQ since or before then.

With respect to independent claim 1:

GuardianIQ 1.0 teaches a method of evaluating contacts stored in a data source, the method comprising:

Allowing a user to define a data format (data sets); (Column 1 Paragraph [001], discloses a user specifying data sets)

Allowing a user to define a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format, wherein the rules are intended to assess a quality of data; (Column 1 Paragraph [001], discloses that after the user specifies data sets then rules specific to that data sets are drawn from a set of rules, this rules are used to define data quality)

Executing the plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data that allows evaluation of potential contacts according to an assessed quality of the data. (Column 1 Paragraphs [001] and [002], discloses executing the rules on the data sets to generate application code that will include data validation used to define data quality)

GuardianIQ 1.0 doesn't appear to disclose mapping data identifying a plurality of contacts from the data source to the data format.

Anand teaches mapping data identifying a plurality of contacts from the data source to the data format (data type). (Column 2 Lines 9-12, discloses creating a

mapping between data and the data type, this would make the processing of the data easier because the data type of the data would be known therefore making the process much more straight forward)

It would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **mapping data identifying a plurality of contacts from the data source to the data format** because this would make the processing of the data easier because the data type of the data would be known therefore making the process much more straight forward)

With respect to claim 2:

GuardianIQ 1.0 teaches that **the data source is either a database or a spreadsheet file.** (Column 1 Paragraph [005], discloses that the source for the data sets can be either a database or a flat file)

With respect to claim 3,

GuardianIQ 1.0 doesn't appear to disclose that **the data source is a heterogeneous data source.**

Anand teaches that **the data source is a heterogeneous data source.** (Column 1 Lines 8-15, discloses that the information to be used for generating reports will be extracted from a data warehouse which is a collection of databases with related information but with different formats)

With respect to claim 4:

GuardianIQ 1.0 doesn't appear to disclose that **the data source comprises a plurality of sales leads.**

Anand teaches that **the data source comprises a plurality of sales leads.**

(Column 1 Lines 40-46, discloses that the data to be processed for the creation of the reports is business related, therefore it could include sales leads)

With respect to claim 5, GuardianIQ 1.0 teaches:

The plurality of rules that can be defined by a user include spatial rules, age/lineage rules, pattern-based rules (consistency and uniqueness rules), **electronic validation rules and numeric operator-based rules.** (Column 1 Paragraph [002], discloses that the rules to be applied to the data will be based on consistency and uniqueness, both of this rules being pattern-based because both consistency and uniqueness relies on a pattern of data contents)

With respect to claim 9:

GuardianIQ 1.0 teaches **a method of evaluating sales leads stored in a data source, the method comprising:**

Allowing a user to define a data format (data sets); (Column 1 Paragraph [001], discloses a user specifying data sets)

Allowing a user to define a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format, wherein the rules are intended to assess a quality of data (Column 1 Paragraph [001], discloses that after the user specifies data sets then rules specific to that data sets are drawn from a set of rules, this rules are used to define data quality) **and include spatial rules, pattern-based rules (consistency and uniqueness rules) and electronic validation rules;** (Column 1 Paragraph [002], discloses that the rules will be based on consistency and uniqueness) **the data source is either a database or spreadsheet file;** (Column 1 Paragraph [005], discloses that the source for the data sets can be either a database or a flat file) **and**

Executing the plurality of rules on the data to score the data and produce a set of analyzed data usable to assess the quality of data in the data source.
(Column 1 Paragraphs [001] and [002], discloses executing the rules on the data sets to generate application code that will include data validation used to define data quality)

GuardianIQ 1.0 doesn't explicitly teach **mapping data identifying a plurality of sales leads from the data source to the data format.**

Anand teaches **mapping data identifying a plurality of sales leads from the data source to the data format.** (Column 2 Lines 9-12, discloses creating a mapping between data and the data type and that the data to be processed for the creation of the reports is business related, therefore it could include sales leads, this would make the processing of the data easier because the data type of the data would be known therefore making the process much more straight forward)

With respect to claim 12:

GuardianIQ 1.0 teaches that the plurality of rules that can be defined by a user further comprise age/lineage rules and numeric operator-based rules. (Column 2 Paragraph [002], discloses a Not-Null rule to be applied against the data sets, this not-null rule is clearly a numeric operator based rule, because it relies in comparing)

With respect to independent claim 13:

GuardianIQ 1.0 teaches A system for evaluating contacts stored in data source, the system comprising:

A user interface component configured to allow one or more users to define a data format (data sets); (Column 1 Paragraph [001], discloses a user specifying data sets) define a plurality of rules that operate on, and are intended to assess a quality of, data formatted according to the data format; (Column 1 Paragraph [001], discloses that after the user specifies data sets then rules specific to that data sets are drawn from a set of rules, this rules are used to define data quality) and

A rules engine component configured to execute the plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data that allows evaluation of potential contacts according to an assessed quality of the data. (Column 1

Paragraphs [001] and [002], discloses executing the rules on the data sets to generate application code that will include data validation used to define data quality)

Guardian IQ 1.0 doesn't appear to disclose **map data identifying a plurality of contacts from the data source to the data format.**

Anand teaches **mapping data identifying a plurality of contacts from the data source to the data format.** (Column 2 Lines 9-12, discloses creating a mapping between data and the data type, this would make the processing of the data easier because the data type of the data would be known therefore making the process much more straight forward)

Claims 6, 7, 10, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "GuardianIQ 1.0: The Business Rule Approach to DQ" herein after GuardianIQ 1.0 as in view of Anand et al (US Patent 5,721,903) and Fagin et al (US Patent 6,014,664).

With respect to claim 6:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.**

Fagin teaches **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data** because this would help in the fact that then the user could have an idea of which results are more important.

With respect to claim 7:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score.**

Fagin teaches that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score.** (Column 8 Lines 54-47, discloses that the user will create the scoring for each rule therefore the user is the one responsible for the ranking of the data)

With respect to claim 10:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.**

Fagin teaches that **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data** because this would help in the fact that then the user could have an idea of which results are more important.

With respect to claim 14:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **the user interface component allows users to associate a score with each defined rule and wherein the rules engine component scores the mapped data during execution of the plurality of rules.**

Fagin teaches that **the user interface component allows users to associate a score with each defined rule and wherein the rules engine component scores the mapped data during execution of the plurality of rules.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

With respect to claim 15:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **the user interface is further configured to allow a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules.**

Fagin teaches that **the user interface is further configured to allow a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules.** (Column 8 Lines 54-47, discloses that the user will create the scoring for each rule therefore the user is the one responsible for the ranking of the data)

Claims 8, 11 and 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "GuardianIQ 1.0: The Business Rule Approach to DQ" herein after GuardianIQ 1.0 as in view of Anand et al (US Patent 5,721,903) and Hibbetts et al (US Patent 5,787,418).

With respect to claim 8:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.**

Hibbetts teaches that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.** (Column 5 Lines 1-13, discloses a user being

able to sort data into tables by selecting data based on its attributes, this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **that after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user** because this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional.

With respect to claim 11:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.**

Hibbetts teaches that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.** (Column 5 Lines 1-13, discloses a user being able to sort data into tables by selecting data based on its attributes, this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional)

With respect to claim 16:

The combination of GuardianIQ 1.0 and Anand discussed above doesn't appear to explicitly disclose **that the user interface is further configured to, after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules, allow a user to sort data from the set of analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.**

Hibbetts teaches **that the user interface is further configured to, after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules, allow a user to sort data from the set of analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.** (Column 5 Lines 1-13, discloses a user being able to sort data into tables by selecting data based on its attributes, this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariela D. Reyes whose telephone number is (571) 270-1006. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 7:30- 5:00 East time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone

MR Mar 8th, 2007
MR

DL

DL
3/9/07



JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100